UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/920,433	08/29/1997	KATHRYN A. ROSENTHAL	~~43-97-001~~ 014208.1183	8464

7590   02/27/2002

David G. Wille, Esq.
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2100 Ross Avenue
Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

DOCKETED

Amendment Due:
May 27, 2002

EXAMINER
THOMSON, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Docket _____ ✓ Wrapper _____ ✓

RVF Docketed _____ N/A

Reference(s) _____

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
08/920,433	Rosenthal
Examiner	Art Unit
William Thomson	2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___3___ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
  be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
  communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Nov 13, 2001*

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-21* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
            application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A. Summary of Prosection:

Request for Continued Examination

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37

CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for

continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been

timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR

1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/13/01 has been entered.

2.   RCE has been filed to continue the prosecution.

3.   Applicant has provided no amendments to claims 1, 7, and 9-19.

4.   Claim 8 has been canceled. New claims are presented as claims 20 and 21.

5.   Applicant has amended the figures and specification to coincide with the claims.

6.   Claims 1-7, 9-21 have been examined and rejected.

B. Objections to the Specification and Claims:

Specification

7.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative

of the invention to which the claims are directed. Specifically, the title is currently directed to a

family of devices. Examiner does not agree and will change the title if there comes a time for

allowance of the instant invention.

8.   Applicant has overcome the new matter objection. Examiner has removed the new matter

objection. This has been based on Applicant's response and request for reconsideration after final,

paper #16. However, this amendment provides no more enablement to the specification than that

which was ordinally taught within the original specification since this was drawn from the claim

language as ordinally filed.

Drawings

9.   Applicant has overcome the objection to the drawings, see paper #16. The proposed

drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on February 27, 2001

have been approved. However, they present only that which was disclosed within the claims as

ordinally filed and provide no more enablement or teaching than the claims as filed with the

original specification as filed.

C. Claim Interpretation and Definitions

Preamble of the Claims

10.   The preamble of the claims presented for examination have not been given patentable

weight. Appropriate weight is given to limitations recited in the body of the claim that are needed

for the purpose of antecedence. "A mere statement of purpose or intended use in the preamble of

a claim need not be considered in finding anticipation; however, it must be considered if the

language of a preamble is necessary to give meaning to the claim" *Diversitech Corp. v. Century*

Steps, Inc., 7 USPQ2d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Stencel, 4 USPQ2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1987)

Claim Interpretation

11.   Examiner has given the broadest reasonable interpretation to the Applicant's claim

language. As such, Examiner is providing a number of terms as defined in the art and used to

interpret Applicant's claim language.   Examiner is interpreting the following terms in light of the

Applicant's specification and the well known definitions of the prior art teachings. An Applicant

can be her own lexicographer. While applicant may be his or her own lexicographer, a term in a

claim may not be given a meaning repugnant to the usual meaning of that term, *In re Hill*, 161

F.2d 367, 73 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). Examiner has used Applicant's definitions and those

which are well know and accepted meanings in the art to provide a basis for the relevance of

specific rejected limitations in view of prior art know made of record. Limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. *In re Van Guens*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057

(Fed. Cir. 1993).

Definitions

Community: May be business, organization, association or any other type of grouping having a

plurality of members. *Applicant's specification.*

Member: Members may be persons, animals, objects or any other type of item of a community. *Applicant's specification.*

Relationship: The state of being related or interrelated. The relation connecting or binding participants in a relationship. A state of affairs existing between those having relations or dealings. An association of information and/or data. *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th ed.*

Assignment: The act of being assigned. A position, post , or office to which one is assigned. A special task or amount of work assigned or undertaken as if assigned by authority. Transfer of *property. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th ed.*

Access Privileges: Access privileges may be automatically granted base on the relationship when a relationship table is interrogated by an application that may activate an assignment. The assignment is approved then activated. The relationship and assignment provide the basis for the access level or privilege level. Limited access privileges may be a subset of access privileges of the administrative manager. Privileges may be varied for administrative and/or work assignment managers. Privileges, relationships and assignments are *stored. Applicant's specification*

Manager: A person responsible for the actions of a member within a group. Mangers may have disparate access privileges based on their position to access member information. Managers can

change their position in the organization(s). Access privileges can also change. Mangers have various levels of access to member information based on their position in an organization(s). Manger is a user with different levels of access than other users. *Applicant's specification, Well Known in the Art.*

Disparate access privileges: Different relationships may provide the managers with disparate access privileges to records of members reporting to mangers. In a community a member may be administratively assigned to a position of an organization A and be work assigned to an additional position of another organization B. The member is reporting to two different manages in two different organizations. Manager A has administrative responsibility for the member, while Manager B has work assignment responsibility. Manager A has a higher level of access to the member's information than the access level afforded Manager B. A manger is a user of the system with specific access privileges. *Applicant's specification, Well Known in the Art.*

F. FORMAL PRIOR ART REJECTION(s) and RESPONSES

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/01 and 11/13/01 have been fully considered. This response has been necessitated by Applicant's amendments and arguments. Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art of record are simply not persuasive. Examiner's immediate

supervisor is Kevin Teska. Mr. Teska can be reached at 703-305-9704. Please feel free to contact him regarding this case.

Specific Response to Arguments and Amendments

13.   Applicant in reviewing the specification, should note that the term/phrase "community" is by her own definition a "group[ing]". The claims are read in light of the specification, limitations have not been read into the claims. When a term/phrase is ambiguous, such as "community" in the context of the claims, the Examiner must go to the specification to distill what Applicant is actually intending to claim as her invention. Examiner would like to point out to Applicant that the claim interpretations were indeed recited directly from the specification and from which both enablement and support have been drawn. Perhaps Applicant should review the specification to actually determine what she is attempting to cover with the presented claims that must be novel and patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The rejection is clear to the issues at hand. However, to date, no specific limitation has been shown to be missing from the prior art teachings. Apparently the Applicant must not be clear on the usage of groups as it pertains to access privileges and the associated role or position of members of the group. It is not the job of the examiner to educate the Applicant, especially knowing the skill level of the Applicant in the art of access privilege control.

14.   Examiner appreciates Applicant directing him to the fact that each and every limitation

must be taught, either expressly or inherently [sic] within the prior art used to reject the claims

presented. The prior art asserted is not overcome because the prior art includes extra features

that may not be disclosed within Applicant's specification. Each and every limitation is expressly

or inherently taught within the prior art asserted. Mere attorney argument in the absence of

evidence is simply not persuasive. As can be clearly seen in the rejections of the claims, note

sections on page 15 et seq. of paper # 14, that the claims in their entirety have been rejected.

This was based on both proper analysis and Applicant's own admittance that the prior art clearly

teaches the claimed invention.   In two years of prosecution, Applicant has yet to distinguish her

invention over the well known standard known as RBAC and the integral prior art teachings of

multilevel (also known as hierarchical) access control. No limitation recited within the claims has

been overlooked. The response section of an Office Action is used to respond to Applicant's

specific arguments and possibly help guide them into claiming an invention not yet disclosed in the

prior art teachings. Nothing in the prior Office Actions should have been construed as the

Examiner only partially or selectively interpreting, overly simplifying or dissecting the claims for

piecemeal rejection of the claims. Each and every claim and related limitation in its entirety has

been examined and rejected based on the merits.

15.   In regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st para., Examiner has made a proper

factual finding by applying all the issues as outlined in MPEP 2164. Applicant is respectfully

directed to further review MPEP § 2164.08 (scope or breadth of the claims), § 2164.05(a) (nature

of the invention and state of the prior art), § 2164.05(b) (level of one of ordinary skill), § 2164.03

(level of predictability in the art and amount of direction provided by the inventor), § 2164.02 (the

existence of working examples) and § 2164.06 (quantity of experimentation needed to make or

use the invention based on the content of the disclosure)." Applicant has not provided a working

example of the alleged invention. Examiner has provided more than adequate inquiry to Applicant

to provide anything that might show enablement with no success. Examiner reiterates that the

mere statement that the invention "automatically providing... access privileges" does not provide

either enablement or a proper written description of these limitations.

As has been previously pointed out by applicant the fact that the instant invention

performs these access privileges automatically is a major part of the invention, essential to its

success and operation. However, Applicant still can not go to the specification and pull out any

relative teaching that would support this very important aspect of her invention. Applicant is

required to file the specification with an appropriate amount of specificality to enable one to

reduce the claimed invention to practice. This burden has yet to be met. Mere attorney argument

in the absence of evidence is simply not persuasive.

However, on the other hand, since Applicant has conceded to the fact that such systems

are indeed so well known that no substantive disclosure is needed, then the Examiner kindly

welcomes this admittance. As can be openly seen in the prior art teachings Applicant's claimed

invention has been widely implemented and therefore is very well established and old in the arts.

Therefore, by Applicants own admittance, paper 20, the inventive aspect of automatically

providing access privileges is well known. Examiner, based on Applicant's prior arguments

(paper 13), had believed that there might have been some aspect of this feature that was not

explicitly taught in the prior art, now it is clear that this is not the case. Since Applicant has stated

on the record that the prior art of record shows how well known this feature is, the Examiner will

remove the rejection since he does agree that based on the level of skill in the art, the

predictability of the art and that which is well known in the art is all that is in fact recited in these

limitations. However, Examiner disagrees with any statement that the specification provides a

work that was actually conducted or results actually achieved. Lastly, Applicants could not

provide a modicum of code to substantiate either a reduction or working model.

16.   The prior art explicitly teaches the claimed limitations and more. There appears to be only

two distinctions that Applicant has raised over the prior art teachings (pagers 4, 6, 9, 13 and 16).

The first is that the prior art references do not teach "automatically" providing access privileges.

This is an interesting approach since neither does Applicant's specification. However, in the case

of trying to delineate a difference based solely on "automatic" verses "manual" there is no

patentable distinction between the them. In other words the mere automation of a manual process

is not patentable by it self. Further, Applicant has not provided enablement for "automatically"

providing access privileges, except for that which she know admits has been well known in the

arts. Second is the ability to assign members with multi-positions and the ability to reassign

access rights. This is usually called delegation or delegating the role or access privilege (paper

20). The prior art expressly teaches both these features. Neither of these issues provide any

patentable distinction over the prior art teachings. The phrase "manager", for example, has been

called out by Applicant as having some novel aspect in the context of claims, however, the prior

art explicitly teaches managers, hierarchical systems and the like that have access privileges to

records of members and further allow for managers or members to delegate access privileges so

as to let them share a resource (also know as a object, file, device and many other computer

related systems).

MPEP explicitly states: "A prima facie case of unpatentability is established when the

information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of

evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable

construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence

which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability" and "An

application should not be allowed , unless and until issues pertinent to patentability have been

raised and resolved in the course of examination and prosecution, since otherwise the resultant

patent would not justify the statutory presumption of validity (35 U.S.C. 282), nor would it

"strictly adhere" to the requirements laid down by Congress in the 1952 Act as interpreted by the

Supreme Court. The standard to be applied in all cases is the "preponderance of the evidence"

test. In other words, an examiner should reject a claim if, in view of the prior art and evidence of

record, it is more likely than not that the claim is unpatentable " and "In rejecting claims for want

of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command.

When a reference is *complex* or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the

applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence

of each reference, *if not apparent*, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified"

Examiner does not believe this application raises to the level of "complex" especially knowing the

Assignee's relative level of experience in the field of computer access models.

Anticipation is a question of fact. *In re King, 801 F.2d 324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir.*

1986). The inquiry as to whether a reference anticipates a claim must focus on what subject

matter is encompassed by the claim and what subject matter is described by the reference. As set

forth by the court in *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp. , 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781, 789*

(Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied , 465 U.S. 1026 (1984), it is only necessary for the claims to "

'read on' something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations in the claim are found in the

reference, or 'fully met' by it."Where, as here, a reference describes a class of compositions, the

reference must be analyzed to determine whether it describes a composition(s) with sufficient

specificity to constitute an anticipation under the statute. See *In re Schaumann 572 F.2d 312,*

197 USPQ 5 (CCPA 1978). (reciting from: Ex parte Lee, BPAI at 31 USPQ2d 1105)

Examiner without any relevant evidence to the contrary had determined that the

Applicant's claims pending in the instant case were and are not patentable nor allowable over the

prior art made of record. Applicant was charged with the duty to rebut and provide evidence in

the contrary of the Examiner's assertion of the prior art. The statement of what a piece of prior

art can do does not provide any substantive response to how it explicitly differs from the claims

that presented in the instant invention.

Examiner further addresses Applicant's position regarding the multiple rejections directed

to claims. There is nothing precluding the assertion of multiple references against pending claims.

In the instant case there were seven different references asserted. Examiner has made a prima

facie case regarding the patentability of Applicant's claims as filed. Note that the level of skill is

presumed to be at least one of ordinary skill. Applicant is presumed to have at least this level of

knowledge of the art. The rejection was intentionally structured to recite 'clearly anticipated'. No

more explanation was required presuming that Applicant was at least ones of ordinary skill level

in the art. However, the Examiner did provide a detailed listing of relevant citations for each

reference to help direct the Applicant to understand the depth and scope of their individual

teachings.

As to the allegations of using a omnibus rejection, or piecemeal examination and use of a

multiplicity of references, Examiner provides Applicant's representative with the following. Each

claim is clearly anticipated by each and every reference asserted. On the face and with a minimal

amount of diligence, Appellants' representative should have been able to ascertain the relevance

of each and every reference. Examiner only provided a very small subset of all the references that

anticipate (whether clearly or not) every claim as presented within Applicants' application.

To restate the obvious "examiner is not called upon to cite all the references that may be

available, but only the best.." Examiner used only a subset of the "best" references since they

clearly anticipate all of Appellants' claimed limitations. Examiner did not cite "all the references that may be available", only five out of many more possible references. Specifically, Examiner did not cite any of the articles from a number of symposiums on role-based access or the military specifications that directly relate to the instant invention. A mere sampling of either family of specifications or articles would clearly anticipate all of the Applicant's independent claims and their dependencies. The breath of which Applicant has drafted their claim language can be reasonably interpreted to be anticipated by many different publications and patents. Examiner provided only a reasonably small grouping of prior art that clearly anticipates both the instant invention and the claimed invention.

Claim 1, recites nothing more than storing an assignment of a member of a community to a first position in the community to generate a first relationship; automatically providing a manager of the first position with access privileges to records of the member based on the first relationship; storing an additional assignment of the member to a second position in the community to generate a second relationship; and during pendency of the additional assignment, automatically providing a manager of the second position with disparate access privileges to records of the member based on the second relationship. This is nothing more than associating which data files a specific user has access privileges to, allowing this relationship to be reassigned and providing different levels of access to different data based on the associations between users and data. As applicants have admitted, the feature of automatically providing...access privileges is well established in the prior art. In simpler terms, a standard well known and off the shelf access privilege setting scheme that

has been in existence for decades.   An access control system based on users positions within an

organization relationship to allowed data access and delegation of the access to that data is within

the scope of this claim. The prior asserted explicitly teaches all the claim limitations as recited.

Examiner believes that Applicant has attempted to cover "user-role" or "role-based"

access control for a distributed system, however have fallen far short of actually claiming any

improvement in such a system. Again, these systems are well known and are herewith asserted as

prior art teachings of such systems. Examiner has provided a reference in the rejection to show

what is designed into a functioning RBAC (role based access control) system. (Workshop

Summary from the Proceedings of the First ACM Workshop on Role-Based Access Control,

December 1995, hereafter referred to as *Workshop*)

Applicant is solving the same problem with the same technology in the same manner as the

prior art. There is not an inventive step when all that is claimed is that which is well known and

inherent in the art.   Applicant's invention and the prior art asserted perform the same functions

and operations with the same equipment. This teaching provides for different settings of access

privileges for users, members and groups with affiliations between the user and the object or data.

This includes delegation of access privileges and roles.

Within the prior art teachings, the privilege levels of users, members, groups or manager

users can be changed. A manager user can be afforded access rights a one level to one set of data

and also be afforded different access rights to a second set of data. Users can be afforded different

access levels to different data within different or the same system. In general Applicants are

merely attempting to claim setting access privileges based on a business organizational chart

where the access privileges can be changed and delegated. Applicant has vialed the standard

RBAC, multilevel group, membership and user access privilege system in the cloak of business

method by attempting to cloud the issues by highlighting labels attached to users within the

hierarchy, such as a "manager", and related "positions" within the organization that are afforded

various access levels to information. This is merely setting labels to specific users. A manger is a

user with different levels of access relative to others in the organization. The ability to transfer

access or membership is built into security systems. In fact, in general most systems do not want

this feature available to the user so that data may be compartmented and secured. There can be

afforded no patentable weight when the distinction is merely a label or specific use for a well

known method, system, apparatus or processes.

One implementing anyone of the prior art teachings would yield a system that would

function as Applicant has claimed as inventive. Applicant is reminded that a recitation of the

intended use of the claimed invention must result in a **structural difference** between the claimed

invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior

art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In

a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as

compared to the prior art. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136

USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The components and their operations, as taught within the prior

art teachings are functional equivalents, identical in operation and provide inherent operations

that have an inevitable presence and are well known in the art. *In re Bond, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990), In re Robertson, 49 USPQ2d 1949 (Fed. Cir. 1999)*

Applicant has not provided any effective argument as to any patentable distinction, improvement or unexpected result that might occur over the prior art teachings when Applicant's method of providing different access privileges to different users based on affiliations than that which are built into the prior art teachings. Applicant appears to believe the novelty is within the ability of the system to store and change data relating to providing changeable access privileges to different users with varying levels of access. This is merely using the well known tool of the trade for its specific purpose. The courts have held that "A reference anticipates a claim if it discloses the claimed invention such that a skilled artisan could take its teachings in combination with his own knowledge of the particular art and be in possession of the invention." *In re Graves, 36 USPQ2d 1697 (Fed. Cir. 1995); In re Sase, 207 USPQ 107 (CCPA 1980); In re Samour, 197 USPQ 1 (CCPA 1978).*

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

17.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who

has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

18.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Rabitti et al. or Baldwin or Demurjian et al. or Abraham et al.(903) or Howell et al. et al. or *Workshop on Role Based Access (1995)* and rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Deinhart et al. or Barkley.

Taking claim 1, for example, Rabitti et al. and Baldwin and Demurjian and Abraham et al.(903) and Deinhart et al. and Barkley and Howell et al. et al. disclose:

Rabitti et al.: Abstract, sections entitled: Instruction, 2.2 Intuitive Overview of the Basic Authorization Concepts, 3 Implication Rules, Figures 7-9 with related text, 3.3 Authorization Objects, 3.3.2 Association of Authorization Types with Authorization Objects, 3.3.4 Rules for Computing Implicit Strong Authorizations, 4 Implicit Authorizations for Object-Oriented and Semantic Modeling Concepts, 5 Implementation Considerations, 5.1 Role Lattice, 5.2 , 5.2.2 Access Strategies
Baldwin: Title, Abstract, Introduction, sections entitled: Groups Object Privileges and Individuals, page 119, Managing Changes to the Security Configuration, Aspects of security administration, page 120, pages 121-128
Demurjian et a.: Title, Abstract, Figures 1-3, sections entitled: 1. Introduction and Motivation, 2.1 An Object-Oriented Design Model, 2.3 A User-Role Definition Hierarchy, 2.3 Method Assignment, 3 The URDH and Application Analysis, pages 198-202.

Abraham et al.(903): Title, Abstract, Figures 2-15, Summary of the Invention, Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments, col. 9, lines 25 et seq., col. 19, lines 8 et seq.
Deinhart et al.: Title: Method and System for Advanced Role-Based Access control in Distributed and Centralized Computer Systems, Abstract, Figures 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 5, 6 and 7, Description of Prior Art, Summary of the Invention, col. 6, lines 65 et seq., col. 7, lines 16 et seq., col. 8, lines 53 et seq, col. 9, lines 38 et seq.
Barkley: Title: Workflow Management Employing Role-Based Access Control, Abstract, Figure 1 (prior art) and 2, users 26, user ID 28, Subjects 20, roles 30, operations 32, Background of the Invention, Description of the Preferred Embodiments, col. 5, lines 55 et seq.
Howell et al. et al.: Title, Abstract, Figures 2, 3, flow chart in figure 4, col. 2, lines 35 et seq., col. 4, lines 24 et seq., col. 5, lines 23 -55, col. 6, lines 17 et seq., allows for changes in user and group membership access within the organization.

A method of providing access privileges to records of members of a community, comprising

storing an assignment of a member of a community to a first position in the community to generate a first relationship;

automatically providing a manager of the first position with access privileges to records of the member based on the first relationship;

storing an additional assignment of the member to a second position in the community to generate a second relationship; and

during pendency of the additional assignment, automatically providing a manager of

the second position with disparate access privileges to records of the member based on the

second relationship.

As to claim 2, the method of Claim 1, wherein the manager of the second position has

access privileges to records of the member is taught throughout Rabitti et al. and Baldwin and

Demurjian and Abraham et al. (903) and Deinhart et al. and Barkley and Howell et al. et

al.(**Rabitti et al.:** Abstract, sections entitled: Instruction, 2.2 Intuitive Overview of the Basic

Authorization Concepts, 3 Implication Rules, Figures 7-9 with related text, 3.3 Authorization

Objects, 3.3.2 Association of Authorization Types with Authorization Objects, 3.3.4 Rules for

Computing Implicit Strong Authorizations, 4 Implicit Authorizations for Object-Oriented and

Semantic Modeling Concepts, 5 Implementation Considerations, 5.1 Role Lattice, 5.2 , 5.2.2

Access Strategies; **Baldwin:** Title, Abstract, Introduction, sections entitled: Groups Object

Privileges and Individuals, page 119, Managing Changes to the Security Configuration, Aspects

of security administration, page 120, pages 121-128; **Demurjian et a.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 1-

3, sections entitled: 1. Introduction and Motivation, 2.1 An Object-Oriented Design Model, 2.3 A

User-Role Definition Hierarchy, 2.3 Method Assignment, 3 The URDH and Application Analysis,

pages 198-202.; **Abraham et al.(903):** Title, Abstract, Figures 2-15, Summary of the Invention,

Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments, col. 9, lines 25 et seq., col. 19, lines 8 et seq.;

Deinhart et al.: Title: Method and System for Advanced Role-Based Access control in

Distributed and Centralized Computer Systems, Abstract, Figures 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 5, 6 and 7,

Description of Prior Art, Summary of the Invention, col. 6, lines 65 et seq., col. 7, lines 16 et seq.,

col. 8, lines 53 et seq, col. 9, lines 38 et seq.; **Barkley:** Title: Workflow Management Employing

Role-Based Access Control, Abstract, Figure 1 (prior art) and 2, users 26, user ID 28, Subjects

20, roles 30, operations 32, Background of the Invention, Description of the Preferred

Embodiments, col. 5, lines 55 et seq.; **Howell et al. et al.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 2, 3, flow chart

in figure 4, col. 2, lines 35 et seq., col. 4, lines 24 et seq., col. 5, lines 23 -55, col. 6, lines 17 et

seq., allows for changes in user and group membership access within the organization.*)*

As to claim 3, the method of Claim 1, wherein the manager of the first position has access

privileges to administrative records of the member denied to the manager of the second position is

taught throughout Rabitti et al. and Baldwin and Demurjian and Abraham et al. (903) and

Deinhart et al. and Barkley and Howell et al. et al.**(Rabitti et al.:** Abstract, sections entitled:

Instruction, 2.2 Intuitive Overview of the Basic Authorization Concepts, 3 Implication Rules,

Figures 7-9 with related text, 3.3 Authorization Objects, 3.3.2 Association of Authorization

Types with Authorization Objects, 3.3.4 Rules for Computing Implicit Strong Authorizations, 4

Implicit Authorizations for Object-Oriented and Semantic Modeling Concepts, 5 Implementation

Considerations, 5.1 Role Lattice, 5.2 , 5.2.2 Access Strategies; **Baldwin:** Title, Abstract,

Introduction, sections entitled: Groups Object Privileges and Individuals, page 119, Managing

Changes to the Security Configuration, Aspects of security administration, page 120, pages 121-

128; **Demurjian et a.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 1-3, sections entitled: 1. Introduction and

Motivation, 2.1 An Object-Oriented Design Model, 2.3 A User-Role Definition Hierarchy, 2.3

Method Assignment, 3 The URDH and Application Analysis, pages 198-202.; **Abraham et al.(903):** Title, Abstract, Figures 2-15, Summary of the Invention, Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments, col. 9, lines 25 et seq., col. 19, lines 8 et seq.; **Deinhart et al.:** Title: Method and System for Advanced Role-Based Access control in Distributed and Centralized Computer Systems, Abstract, Figures 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 5, 6 and 7, Description of Prior Art, Summary of the Invention, col. 6, lines 65 et seq., col. 7, lines 16 et seq., col. 8, lines 53 et seq, col. 9, lines 38 et seq.; **Barkley:** Title: Workflow Management Employing Role-Based Access Control, Abstract, Figure 1 (prior art) and 2, users 26, user ID 28, Subjects 20, roles 30, operations 32, Background of the Invention, Description of the Preferred Embodiments, col. 5, lines 55 et seq.; **Howell et al. et al.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 2, 3, flow chart in figure 4, col. 2, lines 35 et seq., col. 4, lines 24 et seq., col. 5, lines 23 -55, col. 6, lines 17 et seq., allows for changes in user and group membership access within the organization.*)*

As to claim 4, the method of Claim 1, wherein the additional assignment comprises a tern work assignment is taught throughout Rabitti et al. and Baldwin and Demurjian and Abraham et al. (903) and Deinhart et al. and Barkley and Howell et al. et al.(**Rabitti et al.:** Abstract, sections entitled: Instruction, 2.2 Intuitive Overview of the Basic Authorization Concepts, 3 Implication Rules, Figures 7-9 with related text, 3.3 Authorization Objects, 3.3.2 Association of Authorization Types with Authorization Objects, 3.3.4 Rules for Computing Implicit Strong Authorizations, 4 Implicit Authorizations for Object-Oriented and Semantic Modeling Concepts, 5 Implementation Considerations, 5.1 Role Lattice, 5.2 , 5.2.2 Access Strategies; **Baldwin:** Title,

Abstract, Introduction, sections entitled: Groups Object Privileges and Individuals, page 119,

Managing Changes to the Security Configuration, Aspects of security administration, page 120,

pages 121-128; **Demurjian et a.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 1-3, sections entitled: 1. Introduction

and Motivation, 2.1 An Object-Oriented Design Model, 2.3 A User-Role Definition Hierarchy,

2.3 Method Assignment, 3 The URDH and Application Analysis, pages 198-202.; **Abraham et**

al.(903): Title, Abstract, Figures 2-15, Summary of the Invention, Detailed Description of

Preferred Embodiments, col. 9, lines 25 et seq., col. 19, lines 8 et seq.; **Deinhart et al.:** Title:

Method and System for Advanced Role-Based Access control in Distributed and Centralized

Computer Systems, Abstract, Figures 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 5, 6 and 7, Description of Prior Art,

Summary of the Invention, col. 6, lines 65 et seq., col. 7, lines 16 et seq., col. 8, lines 53 et seq,

col. 9, lines 38 et seq.; **Barkley:** Title: Workflow Management Employing Role-Based Access

Control, Abstract, Figure 1 (prior art) and 2, users 26, user ID 28, Subjects 20, roles 30,

operations 32, Background of the Invention, Description of the Preferred Embodiments, col. 5,

lines 55 et seq.; **Howell et al. et al.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 2, 3, flow chart in figure 4, col. 2,

lines 35 et seq., col. 4, lines 24 et seq., col. 5, lines 23 -55, col. 6, lines 17 et seq., allows for

changes in user and group membership access within the organization.*)*

As to claim 5, the method of Claim 1, wherein the community comprises a business

member comprises an employee of the business is taught throughout Rabitti et al. and Baldwin

and Demurjian and Abraham et al. (903) and Deinhart et al. and Barkley and Caruso et al.**(Rabitti**

et al.: Abstract, sections entitled: Instruction, 2.2 Intuitive Overview of the Basic Authorization

Concepts, 3 Implication Rules, Figures 7-9 with related text, 3.3 Authorization Objects, 3.3.2

Association of Authorization Types with Authorization Objects, 3.3.4 Rules for Computing

Implicit Strong Authorizations, 4 Implicit Authorizations for Object-Oriented and Semantic

Modeling Concepts, 5 Implementation Considerations, 5.1 Role Lattice, 5.2 , 5.2.2 Access

Strategies; **Baldwin:** Title, Abstract, Introduction, sections entitled: Groups Object Privileges and

Individuals, page 119, Managing Changes to the Security Configuration, Aspects of security

administration, page 120, pages 121-128; **Demurjian et a.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 1-3, sections

entitled: 1. Introduction and Motivation, 2.1 An Object-Oriented Design Model, 2.3 A User-Role

Definition Hierarchy, 2.3 Method Assignment, 3 The URDH and Application Analysis, pages

198-202.; **Abraham et al.(903):** Title, Abstract, Figures 2-15, Summary of the Invention,

Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments, col. 9, lines 25 et seq., col. 19, lines 8 et seq.;

Deinhart et al.: Title: Method and System for Advanced Role-Based Access control in

Distributed and Centralized Computer Systems, Abstract, Figures 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 5, 6 and 7,

Description of Prior Art, Summary of the Invention, col. 6, lines 65 et seq., col. 7, lines 16 et seq.,

col. 8, lines 53 et seq, col. 9, lines 38 et seq.; **Barkley:** Title: Workflow Management Employing

Role-Based Access Control, Abstract, Figure 1 (prior art) and 2, users 26, user ID 28, Subjects

20, roles 30, operations 32, Background of the Invention, Description of the Preferred

Embodiments, col. 5, lines 55 et seq.; **Howell et al. et al.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 2, 3, flow chart

in figure 4, col. 2, lines 35 et seq., col. 4, lines 24 et seq., col. 5, lines 23 -55, col. 6, lines 17 et

seq., allows for changes in user and group membership access within the organization.*)*

As to claim 6, the method of Claim 1, wherein the records comprise personnel records of

the member is taught throughout Rabitti et al. and Baldwin and Demurjian and Abraham et al.

(903) and Deinhart et al. and Barkley and Howell et al. et al.(**Rabitti et al.:** Abstract, sections

entitled: Instruction, 2.2 Intuitive Overview of the Basic Authorization Concepts, 3 Implication

Rules, Figures 7-9 with related text, 3.3 Authorization Objects, 3.3.2 Association of

Authorization Types with Authorization Objects, 3.3.4 Rules for Computing Implicit Strong

Authorizations, 4 Implicit Authorizations for Object-Oriented and Semantic Modeling Concepts,

5 Implementation Considerations, 5.1 Role Lattice, 5.2 , 5.2.2 Access Strategies; **Baldwin:** Title,

Abstract, Introduction, sections entitled: Groups Object Privileges and Individuals, page 119,

Managing Changes to the Security Configuration, Aspects of security administration, page 120,

pages 121-128; **Demurjian et a.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 1-3, sections entitled: 1. Introduction

and Motivation, 2.1 An Object-Oriented Design Model, 2.3 A User-Role Definition Hierarchy,

2.3 Method Assignment, 3 The URDH and Application Analysis, pages 198-202.; **Abraham et**

al.(903): Title, Abstract, Figures 2-15, Summary of the Invention, Detailed Description of

Preferred Embodiments, col. 9, lines 25 et seq., col. 19, lines 8 et seq.; **Deinhart et al.:** Title:

Method and System for Advanced Role-Based Access control in Distributed and Centralized

Computer Systems, Abstract, Figures 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 5, 6 and 7, Description of Prior Art,

Summary of the Invention, col. 6, lines 65 et seq., col. 7, lines 16 et seq., col. 8, lines 53 et seq,

col. 9, lines 38 et seq.; **Barkley:** Title: Workflow Management Employing Role-Based Access

Control, Abstract, Figure 1 (prior art) and 2, users 26, user ID 28, Subjects 20, roles 30,

operations 32, Background of the Invention, Description of the Preferred Embodiments, col. 5, lines 55 et seq.; **Howell et al. et al.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 2, 3, flow chart in figure 4, col. 2, lines 35 et seq., col. 4, lines 24 et seq., col. 5, lines 23 -55, col. 6, lines 17 et seq., allows for changes in user and group membership access within the organization.*)*

Claims 7, 9-19 are rejected based on the same reasoning as claims 1-6, *supra.* Claims 7, 9-19 claim the same limitations as claims 1-6 and taught throughout Rabitti et al. and Baldwin and Demurjian and Abraham et al. (903) and Deinhart et al. and Barkley and Howell et al. et al. **(Rabitti et al.:** Abstract, sections entitled: Instruction, 2.2 Intuitive Overview of the Basic Authorization Concepts, 3 Implication Rules, Figures 7-9 with related text, 3.3 Authorization Objects, 3.3.2 Association of Authorization Types with Authorization Objects, 3.3.4 Rules for Computing Implicit Strong Authorizations, 4 Implicit Authorizations for Object-Oriented and Semantic Modeling Concepts, 5 Implementation Considerations, 5.1 Role Lattice, 5.2 , 5.2.2 Access Strategies; **Baldwin:** Title, Abstract, Introduction, sections entitled: Groups Object Privileges and Individuals, page 119, Managing Changes to the Security Configuration, Aspects of security administration, page 120, pages 121-128*;* **Demurjian et a.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 1-3, sections entitled:1. Introduction and Motivation, 2.1 An Object-Oriented Design Model, 2.3 A User-Role Definition Hierarchy, 2.3 Method Assignment, 3 The URDH and Application Analysis, pages 198-202.; **Abraham et al.(903):** Title, Abstract, Figures 2-15, Summary of the Invention, Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments, col. 9, lines 25 et seq., col. 19, lines 8 et seq.; **Deinhart et al.:** Title: Method and System for Advanced Role-Based Access control in

Distributed and Centralized Computer Systems, Abstract, Figures 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 5, 6 and 7,

Description of Prior Art, Summary of the Invention, col. 6, lines 65 et seq., col. 7, lines 16 et seq.,

col. 8, lines 53 et seq, col. 9, lines 38 et seq.; **Barkley:** Title: Workflow Management Employing

Role-Based Access Control, Abstract, Figure 1 (prior art) and 2, users 26, user ID 28, Subjects

20, roles 30, operations 32, Background of the Invention, Description of the Preferred

Embodiments, col. 5, lines 55 et seq.; **Howell et al. et al.:** Title, Abstract, Figures 2, 3, flow chart

in figure 4, col. 2, lines 35 et seq., col. 4, lines 24 et seq., col. 5, lines 23 -55, col. 6, lines 17 et

seq., allows for changes in user and group membership access within the organization.*)*

Conclusion

19.   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months

and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this action. Failure to respond within the period for

response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P.

710.02, 710.02(b)).

20.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to William Thomson whose telephone number is (703) 305-0022. The

examiner can be usually reached between 9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Monday thru Friday. Voice mail is

checked throughout the day. Please leave a detailed message.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's

supervisor, Mr. Kevin Teska, can be reached on 704-305-9704. The fax phone number for this

Group is 703-308-1396.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

William D. Thomson

Patent Examiner
A.U. 2123
February 20, 2002